

is one of degree. The poor have far fewer alternatives in their dependency relationships. This dependency is primarily economic, but the psychological correlates must not be overlooked since they are often paramount to the individual.

One assumption regarding dependency that yields useful insight is that it is associated with hostility toward whatever the person is dependent upon; as dependency increases, so does hostility. One mechanism for relating hostility to dependency is the impossibility of full satisfaction ever being obtainable from the dominant partner in the dependency relationship.²

Such a working understanding of the relationship between hostility and dependency permits certain refinements in poverty program design. In particular, it points up the need to find ways of reducing dependency on the funders of programs as a way of coping with hostility directed toward these funders. In data sections later in this report the reader will note expressed concern on the part of Indian informants that OEO may close down or its funds be cut off. Such concern is related to hostility toward inconsistent treatment which the Indians have received over generations from the Federal Government—an important factor in view of the high degree of Indian dependency on Government, and thus particularly crucial for OEO.

If we take dependency as a focal characteristic of poverty, then in the light of the Indians' high degree of dependency on the Government almost all Indians are "poor." "Welfare" programs of the handout variety mitigate the physical effects of poverty, but not the social or emotional ones. Unilateral withdrawal by the independent partner from the dependency relationship (e.g., Government termination of reservation status) does not solve the economic problems. The OEO approach to Indian poverty is, in broad outline, to give the Indians—the tribal councils in particular—funds for the implementation of programs which are to a limited extent chosen by, and to a larger extent run by, these councils. This gives the tribal councils a degree of independence, and allows them a certain amount of self-assertiveness. However, so long as funds must be applied for every year, and so long as programs may cease when funding stops, the Indians remain dependent on OEO and hostile to the process which makes them concerned that funds may be cut off. In concluding sections of this report we will return to this problem, suggesting ways of dealing with it through self-maintaining programs, and other mechanisms. The problem is raised here insofar as it is a general characteristic of poverty.

A second major characteristic of poverty is apathy. Both apathy and dependency may ultimately relate to passivity—dependency being a way in which the poor relate to others, apathy being a way of withdrawing from such relations.

Much could be said of the importance to the poor of an apathetic world view—in a sense apathy enables the poor person to avoid losing battles from having hopes which are quickly crushed. Important for program planners, however, are two further aspects of apathy: first, apathy is an acceptance of things as they are; second, it is the opposite of manipulative involvement.

Fundamental to the OEO approach to poverty—particularly "Community Action"—is the involvement of the poor in programs on their own behalf. Of necessity this involves creating situations where the poor reject rather than accept major aspects of their social milieu. Among Indians this poses special problems. Reservations are communities in a way that urban ghettos are not. Political leadership on Indian reservations tend to derive from the community rather than being imposed upon it. To build up Indian communities typically requires building up the political structure and reinforcing traditional values. Yet the apathy of the poor can be overcome primarily by an involvement predicated on dissatisfaction and the promise of change.

This seems, at first, paradoxical. The way out of the paradox is selectivity: a selective reinforcement of traditional values and traditional tribal political processes, and selective rejection of reservation situations which need changing. It is difficult to bring about the environment for this selectivity. The problem is that the apathy that program planners must overcome is often associated with perception of the social environment as uniformly devoid of possibilities for change.

It therefore follows that to the extent that apathy about change is associated with beliefs about the uniform impossibility of successful change, it is difficult to

² These points are amplified and supported in: Freud (1922), Macgregor (1961-62: 238-242), and Erikson (1939: 101-156).

Part of the above analysis of dependency and hostility is derived from Macgregor, *op. cit.*